

REMARKS

By this amendment, claims 1-2, 6, and 10-11 have been amended. Claims 1-11 are pending in the application. Applicants reserve the right to pursue the original claims and other claims in this and other applications.

Claims 2 and 6 have been amended in minor fashion, and are now in condition for allowance.

It is respectfully noted that, although the Office Action takes the position on page 2 that the claims do not limit the determining means such that said "determining means retains the first image data without change when the first image data corresponds to the halftone image," the quoted language is directly recited in each of the independent claims in the previous amendment filed July 12, 2006. (Claim 1, ln. 12-13; claim 10, ln 19-21; claim 11, ln. 20-22).

Claims 1-2 and 4-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee et al. (US 6,190,913) in view of Gold et al. (US 3,584,143). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Neither Lee et al. nor Gold et al., even when considered in combination, teaches or suggests all limitations of independent claim 1.

Claim 1 is directed toward correcting a reverse-side projection image from a document having images on both sides, and a comparison made by a flat detection part, an intensity detection part, and an average computing part, which are not taught or suggested by the cited references. Since Lee et al. and Gold do not disclose, teach, or suggest all the limitations of claim 1, claim 1 and dependent claims 2 and 4-6 are not obvious over the cited references. Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 1-2 and 4-6 be withdrawn.

Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee et al. in view of Gold et al., and further in view of Stoffel (US 4,194,221). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 3 depends from claim 1 and is patentable at least for the reasons mentioned above, and on its own merits. Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 3 be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

Claims 7-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee et al. in view of Gold et al., and further in view of Sakamoto et al. (US 5,235,436). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claims 7-9 depend from claim 1 and are patentable at least for the reasons mentioned above, and on their own merits. Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 7-9 be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Claims 10-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee et al. in view of Gold et al., and further in view of Hanyu (US 5,995,658). This rejection is respectfully traversed. None of Lee et al., Gold et al., nor Hanyu, even when considered in combination, teaches or suggests all limitations of independent claims 10 or 11.

Claims 10-11 are directed toward correcting a reverse-side projection image from a document having images on both sides, and a comparison made by a flat detection part, an intensity detection part, and an average computing part, which are not taught or suggested by the cited references. Since Lee et al., Gold et al., and Hanyu do not teach or suggest all of the limitations of claims 10-11, nor are the references combinable, claims 10-11 are not obvious over the cited references. Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 10-11 be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

In view of the above amendment, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: February 27, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Mark J. Thronson

Registration No.: 33,082

Rachael Lea Leventhal

Registration No.: 54,266

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP

1825 Eye Street NW

Washington, DC 20006-5403

(202) 420-2200

Attorneys for Applicants